



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/711,791

10/05/2004

Rahul SRIVASTAVA

ORCL-006/OID-2004-061-01

5790

26392

7590

10/19/2006

LAW FIRM OF NAREN THAPPETA
C/O LONDON IP, INC.
1700 DIAGONAL ROAD, SUITE 450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

BASHORE, WILLIAM L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/711,791

Applicant(s)

SRIVASTAVA, RAHUL

Examiner

William L. Bashore

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/7/04, 4/27/06.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2176

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: original application filed 10/5/2004. IDS filed 12/7/2004, and 4/27/2006.
2. Claims 1-40 pending. Claims 1, 12, 21, 32 are independent.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following: Applicant's Specification, Abstract, and Claims utilize a particular font and letter spacing which is difficult for the examiner to analyze. For example, the letters "c" and "l" in the word "claim" (i.e. see claim 2: "*The method of claim 1...*") are so close together that it strongly resembles the letter "d". Similar problems exist throughout said disclosure specification, abstract, and claims. Applicant is required to submit a new disclosure using an appropriate font and letter spacing so as to prevent future problems with analysis and scanning. Applicant is advised against the addition of new matter. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2176

5. **Claims 1-2, 12-13, 21-22, and 32-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nielsen (hereinafter Nielsen), U.S. PG Pub No. US 2004/0205567, filed 1/22/2002.**

In regard to independent claims 1, 12, 21, 32, Nielsen discloses a method of parsing a data file (an XML markup language file) typically containing a plurality of data elements (tags, etc.) (Nielsen Abstract).

Nielsen discloses receiving an XML test file for analysis inasmuch as files of said type are typically assigned file identifiers (i.e. a filename) so as to be identified by Nielsen's invention (Nielsen Abstract, paragraph [0031]).

Nielsen discloses parsing an XML file into a DOM tree, and each attribute or node in said tree is analyzed accordingly, each said node reasonable interpreted as data elements within a plurality of data elements (nodes) (Nielsen paragraphs [0058], [0061], [0062]).

Nielsen discloses determining a replacement for an element node, said replacement utilizing XPath for replacing a portion of the document (i.e. a portion identifier) (Nielsen paragraphs [0052], [0062]).

Nielsen discloses the above analysis and replacement methods conducted during runtime (using an application) (Nielsen Abstract), therefore data is provided accordingly.

In regard to dependent claims 2, 13, 22, 33, Nielsen discloses XPath (Nielsen paragraph [0052]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 3-9, 14-20, 23-29, 34-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen as applied to claims 1, 12, 21, 32 above, and further in view of Cseri et al. (hereinafter Cseri), U.S. PG Pub. No. US 2003/0046317 filed 4/19/2001.**

In regard to dependent claim 3-5, 14-16, 23-25, 34-36, Nielsen does not specifically teach APIs, procedure calls, and event based parsers. However, Cseri teaches a method of incorporating binary formatting into XML utilizing parsing of an XML file into a DOM tree, along with XPath (Cseri Abstract, paragraph [0028]). Cseri teaches SAX, which is a simple API for XML, which is event based and typically comprising one or more procedure calls (Cseri paragraph [0028]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Cseri to Nielsen, providing Nielsen the benefit of decreasing parsing time utilizing at least in part APIs, SAX, etc.

In regard to dependent claims 6-9, 17-19, 26-29, 37-40, said claims incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1, 3, 12, 14, 21, 23, 32, 34, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

Nielsen does not specifically teach object oriented parsing. However, Cseri teaches object oriented programming (Cseri paragraph [0157]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Cseri to Nielsen, providing Nielsen the benefit of object oriented programming for multiple instantiation etc.

Nielsen teaches a find request - an abbreviated version, and a get request - a non-abbreviated version of an object (Nielsen paragraph [0045]).

Art Unit: 2176

8. **Claims 10-11, 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen and Cseri as applied to claims 3, 14, 23, 34 above, and further in view of Imamura et al. (hereinafter Imamura), U.S. PG Pub. No. US 2004/0261019 filed 4/1/2004.**

In regard to dependent claims 10-11, 30-31, Nielsen does not specifically teach push parsing. However, Imamura teaches parsing in association with XPath and pushing (Imamura paragraph [0160]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Imamura to Nielsen, providing Nielsen the benefit of pushing for more efficient parsing.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William L. Bashore whose telephone number is (571) 272-4088. The examiner can normally be reached on 11:30am - 8:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
October 15, 2006